REMARKS

In the non-final Office Action, the Examiner objects to claims 25-29 for allegedly reciting terms which are not supported by the specification; rejects claims 1, 3-5 and 7-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter; rejects claims 10-12, 20-22, and 25-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as allegedly being anticipated by Applicant's alleged Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter "AAPA"); rejects claims 1, 3, 5, 7-9, 13-19, 23, 24, 28 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over AAPA in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0177015 to Galai (hereinafter "GALAI") and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0117349 to Moricz (hereinafter "MORICZ"); and rejects claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over AAPA in view of GALAI and MORICZ, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0158429 to Bary (hereinafter "BARY") and U.S. Patent No. 6,952,730 to Najork (hereinafter "NAJORK"). Applicant respectfully traverses this objection and these rejections.

By way of the Amendment, Applicant amends claims 1, 10, 15-18, 20, 25, and 26-29 to improve form. No new matter has been added by the present Amendment. Claims 1, 3-5, and 7-29 are pending.

Alleged Admitted Prior Art

At the outset, Applicant would like to address the Examiner's allegation regarding the alleged Applicant's Admitted Prior Art. The Examiner alleges that lines 11-19 on p. 13 of Applicant's specification is Admitted Prior Art (Office Action, p. 4). Applicant disagrees with and traverses the Examiner's allegation.

Lines 11-13 on p. 13 of Applicant's specification disclose:

> Of these initially identified substrings, content manager 320 may classify a sub-string as a session identifier
> if the sub-string appears in multiple URLs in the set.

This section of Applicant's specification does not include an admission of prior art. Therefore,

the Examiner cannot rely on this section of Applicant's specification in a rejection of Applicant's

claims.

Lines 16-19 of Applicant's specification disclose:

> Additionally, when classifying a sub-string on a web site, additional factors, such as the general directory
> structure of the web site, may be taken into consideration.

This section of Applicant's specification does not include an admission of prior art. Therefore,

the Examiner cannot rely on this section of Applicant's specification in a rejection of Applicant's

claims.

Nothing in p. 13, lines 11-19 of Applicant's specification would lead one skilled in the art

to conclude that the above sentences are admitted prior art, as the Examiner alleges.

Claim objections

The Examiner objects to claims 25-29 for allegedly reciting terms which are not

supported by the specification. Applicant respectfully traverses this objection.

The Examiner alleges the term "computer-readable memory" lacks clear support in the

specification (Office Action, pp. 2-3). Applicant has amended claims 25-29 to address the

Examiner's concerns and solely to expedite prosecution. Support for the claim amendments can

be found, for example in paragraph [0028] and Fig. 2, item 230 of the application. Accordingly,

Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to claims 25-29 be reconsidered and

withdrawn.

<u>Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101</u>

Claims 1, 3-5 and 7-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Examiner alleges that a device comprising "a fetch bot," "content manager," and "URL manager" does not include any functional hardware structure (Office Action, p. 3). The Examiner appears to be referring to independent claim 15. Without acquiescing in the Examiner's rejection, Applicant has amended independent claim 15 to address the Examiner's concerns and in order to expedite prosecution.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that claim 15 is directed to statutory matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 16-19 depend from claim 15. Therefore, these claims are directed to statutory matter for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 15. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 16-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The Examiner further alleges that method claims 1 and 10 do not appear to be tied to another statutory class (Office Action, p. 3). Without acquiescing in the Examiner's rejection, Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 10 to address the Examiner's concerns and in order to expedite prosecution.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that claims 1 and 10 are directed to statutory matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 3-5 and 7-9 depend from claim 1. Therefore, these claims are directed to statutory matter for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 3-5 and 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) based on AAPA

Claims 10-12, 20-22, and 25-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as allegedly anticipated by AAPA. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

A proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires that a reference teach every aspect of the claimed invention. Any feature not directly taught must be inherently present. See M.P.E.P. § 2131. AAPA does not disclose the combination of features recited in Applicants' claims 10-12, 20-22, and 25-27.

Amended independent claim 10 is directed to a method performed by a computer system. The method includes receiving, by a communication interface or an input device of the computer system, a set of uniform resource locators (URLs); analyzing, by a processor of the computer system, the set of URLs for sub-strings that are structured in a manner consistent with session identifiers; and further analyzing, by the processor, the set of URLs to identify one of the sub-strings as corresponding to a session identifier based on multiple occurrences of the sub-string in the set of URLs. AAPA does not disclose or suggest this combination of features.

For example, AAPA does not disclose analyzing, by a processor, a set of URLs to identify one of the sub-strings as corresponding to a session identifier based on multiple occurrences of the sub-string in the set of URLs, as recited in amended claim 10. The Examiner

relies on lines 14-19 on p. 13 of Applicant's specification in the rejection of this feature of claim

10 (Office Action, p. 15). Applicant submits that this rejection is improper.

As stated above, lines 16-19 of Applicant's specification do not contain an admission of

prior art. Therefore, the Examiner cannot rely on this section of Applicant's specification in a

rejection of Applicant's claims. For at least this reason, a *prima facie* case of obviousness with

respect to claim 10 has not been established.

Applicant further submits that lines 14-15 of p. 13 of Applicant's specification do not

disclose the features recited in claim 5.

Lines 14-15 of p. 13 of Applicant's specification disclose:

> One of ordinary skill in the art will recognize that a number of possible classification techniques are known in the art and could be used to initially locate the sub-strings in the URLs that are candidates for being session identifiers.

This section of Applicant's specification discloses that a number of possible classification

techniques are known in the art. This section of Applicant's specification does not disclose that

locating sub-strings in URLs that are candidates for being session identifiers is known.

Furthermore, this section of Applicant's specification discloses initially locating sub-strings in

URLs that are candidates for being session identifiers. This section of Applicant's specification

does not disclose multiple occurrences of a sub-string in a set of URLs. Therefore, this section

of Applicant's specification does not disclose analyzing, by a processor, a set of URLs to

identify one of the sub-strings as corresponding to a session identifier based on multiple

occurrences of the sub-string in the set of URLs, as recited in amended claim 10.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that claim 10 is not anticipated by

AAPA. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 10 under 35

U.S.C. § 102(a) based on AAPA be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 11 and 12 depend from claim 10. Therefore, these claims not anticipated by AAPA for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 10. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully that the rejection of claims 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) based on AAPA be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Amended independent claims 20 and 25 recite features similar to, yet possibly of different scope than, features recited above with respect to claim 10. Therefore, these claims are not anticipated by AAPA for at least reasons similar to the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 10. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully that the rejection of claims 20 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) based on AAPA be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 21 and 22 depend from claim 20. Therefore, these claims not anticipated by AAPA for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 20. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully that the rejection of claims 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) based on AAPA be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 26 and 27 depend from claim 25. Therefore, these claims not anticipated by AAPA for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 25. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully that the rejection of claims 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) based on AAPA be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on AAPA, GALAI and MORICZ

Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-9, 13-19, 23, 24, 28 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over AAPA in view of GALAI and further in view of MORICZ. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Amended independent claim 1 is directed to a method performed by a computer system. The method includes extracting, by a processor of the computer system, a set of uniform resource locators (URLs) from one document or from multiple documents associated with a single web host; identifying, by the processor, sub-strings occurring in multiple URLs in the set of URLs as session identifiers, based on a particular rule and based on the sub-strings occurring in multiple URLs of the set of URLs; generating, by the processor, a clean set of URLs from the set of URLs by removing the session identifiers; and determining, by the processor, when at least one particular URL has already been crawled based on a comparison of the particular URL to the clean set of URLs. AAPA, GALAI, and MORICZ, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest this combination of features.

For example, AAPA, GALAI and MORICZ do not disclose or suggest identifying, by the processor, sub-strings occurring in multiple URLs in the set of URLs as session identifiers, based on a particular rule and based on the sub-strings occurring in multiple URLs of the set of URLs, as recited in amended claim 1. The Examiner relies on p. 13, lines 14-19 of Applicant's specification for allegedly disclosing this feature (Office Action, p. 4). <u>Applicant submits that this rejection is improper.</u>

As stated above, lines 16-19 on p. 13 of Applicant's specification do not contain an admission of prior art. Therefore, the Examiner cannot rely on this section of Applicant's specification in a rejection of Applicant's claims. For at least this reason, a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claim 1 has not been established.

Applicant further submits that lines 14-15 of p. 13 of Applicant's specification do not disclose the above-noted feature of amended claim 1.

Lines 14-15 of p. 13 of Applicant's specification disclose:

> One of ordinary skill in the art will recognize that a number of possible classification techniques are known in the art and could be used to initially locate the sub-strings in the URLs that are candidates for being session identifiers.

This section of Applicant's specification discloses that a number of possible classification techniques are known in the art. This section of Applicant's specification does not disclose that locating sub-strings in URLs that are candidates for being session identifiers is known. Furthermore, this section of Applicant's specification discloses <u>initially</u> locating sub-strings in URLs that are <u>candidates</u> for being session identifiers. This section of Applicant's specification does not disclose identifying <u>sub-string occurring in multiple URLs in a set of URLs</u> as session identifiers. Therefore, this section of Applicant's specification does not disclose identifying, by the processor, sub-strings occurring in multiple URLs in the set of URLs as session identifiers, based on a particular rule and based on the sub-strings occurring in multiple URLs of the set of URLs, as recited in amended claim 1.

GALAI and MORICZ do not disclose or suggest identifying, by the processor, sub-strings occurring in multiple URLs in the set of URLs as session identifiers, based on a particular rule and based on the sub-strings occurring in multiple URLs of the set of URLs, as recited in amended claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over AAPA, GALAI, and MORICZ, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on AAPA, GALAI, and MORICZ be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 3, 5, and 7-9 depend from claim 1. Therefore, these claims are patentable over AAPA, GALAI, and MORICZ, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully

that the rejection of claims 3, 5, and 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on AAPA, GALAI, and

MORICZ be reconsidered and withdrawn. Moreover, these claims are patentable over AAPA,

GALAI, and MORICZ for reasons of their own.

For example, claim 5 recites determining that sub-strings occurring in multiple URLs in

the set of URLs do not reference content. The Examiner relies on lines 14-19 on p. 13 of

Applicant's specification in the rejection of claim 5 (Office Action, p. 5). Applicant submits that

this rejection is improper.

As stated above, lines 16-19 of Applicant's specification do not contain an admission of

prior art. Therefore, the Examiner cannot rely on this section of Applicant's specification in a

rejection of Applicant's claims. For at least this reason, a *prima facie* case of obviousness with

respect to claim 5 has not been established.

Applicant further submits that lines 14-15 of p. 13 of Applicant's specification do not

disclose the features recited in claim 5.

Lines 14-15 of p. 13 of Applicant's specification disclose:

> One of ordinary skill in the art will recognize that a number of possible classification techniques are known in the art and could be used to initially locate the sub-strings in the URLs that are candidates for being session identifiers.

This section of Applicant's specification discloses that a number of possible classification

techniques are known in the art. This section of Applicant's specification does not disclose that

locating sub-strings in URLs that are candidates for being session identifiers is known.

Furthermore, this section of Applicant's specification discloses initially locating sub-strings in

URLs that are candidates for being session identifiers. This section of Applicant's specification

does not disclose determining that sub-strings occurring in multiple URLs in the set of URLs do

not reference content, as recited in claim 5.

For at least these additional reasons, claim 5 is patentable over AAPA, GALAI, and MORICZ.

Claims 13 and 14 depend from claim 10. Without acquiescing in the Examiner's rejection of claims 13 and 14, Applicant submits that GALAI, and MORICZ do not overcome the deficiencies of AAPA set forth above with respect to claim 10. Therefore, claims 13 and 14 are patentable over AAPA, GALAI, and MORICZ, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 10. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully that the rejection of claims 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on AAPA, GALAI, and MORICZ be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Amended independent claim 15 is directed to a device that includes a memory to store instructions; and a processor to execute the instructions to implement at least one fetch bot to download content on a network from locations specified by uniform resource locators (URLs); a content manager to extract URLs from the downloaded content, and identify session identifiers from the URLs extracted from the downloaded content based, at least in part, on multiple occurrences of the session identifiers from a single web site; and a URL manager to create clean versions of the URLs extracted from the downloaded content by removing the session identifiers from the URLs and to store the clean versions of the URLs. AAPA, GALAI, and MORICZ, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest this combination of features.

For example, AAPA, GALAI and MORICZ do not disclose or suggest a processor to execute instructions to implement a content manager to identify session identifiers from URLs extracted from downloaded content based, at least in part, on multiple occurrences of the session identifiers from a single web site, as recited in amended claim 15. The Examiner relies on p. 13,

lines 14-19 of Applicant's specification for allegedly disclosing this feature (Office Action, p. 9).

Applicant submits that this rejection is improper.

As stated above, lines 16-19 of Applicant's specification do not contain an admission of prior art. Therefore, the Examiner cannot rely on this section of Applicant's specification in a rejection of Applicant's claims. For at least this reason, a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claim 15 has not been established.

Applicant further submits that lines 14-15 of p. 13 of Applicant's specification do not disclose the above-noted feature of amended claim 15.

Lines 14-15 of p. 13 of Applicant's specification disclose:

> One of ordinary skill in the art will recognize that a number of possible classification techniques are known in the art and could be used to initially locate the sub-strings in the URLs that are candidates for being session identifiers.

This section of Applicant's specification discloses that a number of possible classification techniques are known in the art. This section of Applicant's specification does not disclose that locating sub-strings in URLs that are candidates for being session identifiers is known. Furthermore, this section of Applicant's specification discloses initially locating sub-strings in URLs that are candidates for being session identifiers. This section of Applicant's specification does not disclose identifying session identifiers based on multiple occurrences of the session identifiers from a single web site. Therefore, this section of Applicant's specification does not disclose a processor to execute instructions to implement a content manager to identify session identifiers from URLs extracted from downloaded content based, at least in part, on multiple occurrences of the session identifiers from a single web site, as recited in amended claim 15.

GALAI and MORICZ do not disclose or suggest a processor to execute instructions to implement a content manager to identify session identifiers from URLs extracted from

downloaded content based, at least in part, on multiple occurrences of the session identifiers from a single web site, as recited in amended claim 15.

Claims 16-19 depend from claim 15. Therefore, these claims are patentable over AAPA, GALAI, and MORICZ, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 15. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully that the rejection of claims 16-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on AAPA, GALAI, and MORICZ be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 23 and 24 depend from claim 20. Without acquiescing in the Examiner's rejection of claims 23 and 24, Applicant submits that GALAI, and MORICZ do not overcome the deficiencies of AAPA set forth above with respect to claim 20. Therefore, claims 23 and 24 are patentable over AAPA, GALAI, and MORICZ, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 20. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully that the rejection of claims 23 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on AAPA, GALAI, and MORICZ be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 28 and 29 depend from claim 25. Without acquiescing in the Examiner's rejection of claims 28 and 29, Applicant submits that GALAI, and MORICZ do not overcome the deficiencies of AAPA set forth above with respect to claim 25. Therefore, claims 28 and 29 are patentable over AAPA, GALAI, and MORICZ, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 25. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully that the rejection of claims 28 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on AAPA, GALAI, and MORICZ be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on AAPA, GALAI, MORICZ, BARY and NAJORK

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over AAPA in view of GALAI, MORICZ, BARY and NAJORK. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 4 depends from claim 1. Without acquiescing in the Examiner's rejection of claim 4, Applicant submits that BARY and NAJORK do not overcome the deficiencies of AAPA, GALAI, and MORICZ set forth above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, claim 4 is patentable over AAPA, GALAI, MORICZ, BARY and NAJORK, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully that the rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on AAPA, GALAI, MORICZ, BARY and NAJORK be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's reconsideration of the application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

While the present application is now believed to be in condition for allowance, should the Examiner find some issue to remain unresolved, or should any new issues arise which could be eliminated through discussions with Applicant's representative, then the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone in order to expedite prosecution of this application.

As Applicant's remarks with respect to the Examiner's rejections are sufficient to overcome these rejections, Applicant's silence as to assertions by the Examiner in the Office Action or certain requirements that may be applicable to such assertions (e.g., whether a reference constitutes prior art, reasons to modify a reference and/or to combine references, assertions as to dependent claims, etc.) is not a concession by Applicant that such assertions are

accurate or such requirements have been met, and Applicant reserves the right to analyze and

dispute such assertions/requirements in the future.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is

hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper,

including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1070 and please credit any excess

fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

HARRITY & HARRITY, LLP

By: /Viktor Simkovic, Reg. No. 56,012/
Viktor Simkovic
Reg. No. 56,012

11350 Random Hills Road
Suite 600
Fairfax, Virginia 22030
(571) 432-0800
CUSTOMER NUMBER: 44989
Date: March 2, 2009